



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/049,148	02/08/2002	Stephan Schambach	376.11	8195

7590 03/01/2005

Richard A Nebb
Dergosits & Noah
Suite 1450
4 Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, CA 94111

EXAMINER

ALI, MOHAMMAD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2167

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/049,148

Applicant(s)

SCHAMBACH ET AL.

Examiner

Mohammad Ali

Art Unit

2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 October 2004.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to the amendment filed on 10/18/04.

Claims 1-22 are pending in this Office Action.

First of all Examiner thanks to the Applicant's for correcting the drawings/specification.

Response to Arguments

2. After further search and a thorough examination of the present application claims 1-22 remain rejected.

Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 1-22 have been considered, but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

First, Applicant's argue that Sixtus and Helland do not teach the claimed features, "method for executing an online transaction wherein the vendor computer includes both a catalog server and a separate transaction server".

In response to the Applicant's arguments the Examiner respectfully submits that Sixtus teaches this limitation as, once the user has found a desired item or service to purchase, which will be displayed in HTML format on a vendor's web page, then the user clicks on the embedded control associated with the selected item. A user client software module is then accessed by the control, which will carry out functions appropriate for executing a transaction request (see col. 7, lines 66 to col. 8, lines 5, Sixtus). Sixtus does not explicitly indicate the claimed catalog server. However, Helland remedy such kinds of deficiency by teaching registering COM attributes and the transaction server execution attribute in the system registry, the server application

component is registered in a transaction server catalog (see col. 11, lines 64-67, Fig. 3, Helland). It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine teachings of cited references because catalog server of Helland's teachings would have allowed Sixtus system for transaction processing with the server application components as suggested by Helland. Further, catalog as taught by Helland improves for transactional attribute of a server application component to performs multiple database updates (see col. 4, lines 1-3, Helland).

Second, Applicant's argue that Helland does not teach the claimed, "catalog server".

In response to the Applicant's arguments the Examiner respectfully submits that Helland teaches this limitation as stated above.

Third, Applicant's argue that Sixtus does not teach the claimed, " transaction-relevant data are transmitted from a catalog server to a transaction server ".

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., transaction-relevant,...) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are

not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Fourth, Applicant's argue that Sixtus does not teach the claimed, "object ID's are assigned to the objects identifying the objects".

In response to the Applicant's arguments the Examiner respectfully submits that Sixtus teaches this limitation as, in accordance with these and other objects, provided is a method for executing a secure online transaction between a vendor computer and a user computer, wherein the vendor computer and the user computer are interconnected to a computer network for data communications therebetween. The method comprises the steps of the user computer transmitting a transaction request message to the vendor computer via the computer network, the transaction request comprising user identification data unique to the user computer (see col. 3, lines 28-36, Sixtus).

Fifth, Applicant's argue that Sixtus does not teach the claimed, "user's request can be transmitted in different formats like XML, WML etc".

In response to the Applicant's arguments the Examiner respectfully submits that Sixtus teaches this limitation as, the user makes a transaction request by selecting an item to be purchased at step 2 by using his mouse or other pointing device associated with the computer 12 to click on a control embedded within the screen page 22 and indicative of the item, for example in HTML (hypertext markup language) format (see col. 40-44, Figs. 2, 3, Sixtus).

Finally, Sixtus and Helland discloses catalog server, transaction server as stated above.

Hence, Applicants' arguments do not distinguish over the claimed invention over the prior art of record.

In light of the foregoing arguments, the 103 rejections are hereby sustained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Timothy Sixtus ('Sixtus' hereafter), USP 5,903,721 in view of Helland et al. ('Helland' hereinafter), USP 5,890,161.

With respect to claim 1,

Sixtus discloses a method of processing an online transaction over a communication network (see col. 3, lines 28-32, Fig. 1), comprising the steps of:

storing a plurality of objects comprising object data and object attributes containing further information about the object in a catalog server (20) accessible by a plurality of clients (10) (see col. 3, lines 28-43, Fig. 1, Sixtus),

displaying, upon request from a client (10), an object including object attributes on a client display (see col. 7, lines 60-66, Fig. 4A, Sixtus), and

executing, on a transaction server (30), a transaction relating to an object selected by the client (10) using the information contained in the object attributes (see col. 8, lines 1-5, Fig. 4A, Sixtus),

wherein the object attributes are transmitted directly from the catalog server (20) to the transaction server (30) (see col. 9, lines 29-30 et seq, Sixtus).

Sixtus does not explicitly indicate the claimed catalog server.

Helland discloses claimed catalog server (registering COM attributes and the transaction server execution attribute in the system registry, the server application component is registered in a transaction server catalog, see col. 11, lines 64-67, Fig. 3, Helland).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine teachings of cited references because catalog server of Helland's teachings would have allowed Sixtus system for transaction processing with the server application components as suggested by Helland. Further,

catalog as taught by Helland improves for transactional attribute of a server application component to performs multiple database updates (see col. 4, lines 1-3, Helland).

With respect to claim 2,

Sixtus discloses a method of processing an online transaction over a communication network comprising (see col. 3, lines 28-32, Fig. 1) the steps of:

storing in a catalog server (20) a plurality of objects comprising object data and object attributes containing further information about the object and further storing an ID identifying the object (see col. 3, lines 28-43, Fig. 1, Sixtus),

transmitting upon request an object together with the corresponding object ID from the catalog server (20) to a client (10) for display (see col. 7, lines 60-66, Fig. 4A, Sixtus),

receiving at the catalog server (20) an object request from a transaction server (30), the request including the object ID (see col. 3, lines 40-43, Fig. 1, Sixtus),

returning from the catalog server (20) to the transaction server (30) the object including object attributes corresponding to the received object ID.

Sixtus does not explicitly indicate the claimed catalog server (see col. 3, lines 50-59, Fig. 1, Sixtus).

Helland discloses claimed catalog server (registering COM attributes and the transaction server execution attribute in the system registry, the server application component is registered in a transaction server catalog, see col. 11, lines 64-67, Fig. 3, Helland).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine teachings of cited references because catalog server of Helland's teachings would have allowed Sixtus system for transaction processing with the server application components as suggested by Helland. Further, catalog as taught by Helland improves for transactional attribute of a server application component to performs multiple database updates (see col. 4, lines 1-3, Helland).

With respect to claim 3,

Sixtus discloses a method of processing an online transaction over a communication network (see col. 3, lines 28-32, Fig. 1) comprising the steps of:

receiving at a transaction server (30) a transaction request with respect to a specific object comprising object data and object attributes containing further information about the object (see col. 3, lines 35-40, Fig. 1, Sixtus),

the request including an object ID identifying that object, the transaction server (30) requesting the object from a catalog server (20), the request including the object ID (see col. 3, lines 40-43, Fig. 1, Sixtus),

receiving at the transaction server (30) from the catalog server (20) the selected object including object attributes (see col. 4, lines 1-5, Fig. 1, Sixtus), and

executing the transaction on the transaction server (30) (see col. 8, lines 1-5, Fig. 4A, Sixtus).

Sixtus does not explicitly indicate the claimed catalog server.

Helland discloses claimed catalog server (registering COM attributes and the transaction server execution attribute in the system registry, the server application

component is registered in a transaction server catalog, see col. 11, lines 64-67, Fig. 3, Helland).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine teachings of cited references because catalog server of Helland's teachings would have allowed Sixtus system for transaction processing with the server application components as suggested by Helland. Further, catalog as taught by Helland improves for transactional attribute of a server application component to performs multiple database updates (see col. 4, lines 1-3, Helland).

As to claim 4,

Sixtus teaches a wherein the object ID is transmitted from the catalog server (20) to the client (10) together with the URL of the server (30) (see col. 7, lines 60-66, Fig. 4A, Sixtus).

As to claim 5,

Sixtus teaches wherein the URL additionally contains a command for executing a specific process on the transaction server (30) (see col. 7, lines 60-66, Fig. 4A, Sixtus).

As to claim 6,

Sixtus teaches wherein the object displayed on a client display is assigned a display field for user selection of the object, wherein the selection of the object by a user initiates a transfer of the ID to the URL of the transaction server (30) (see col. 7, lines 60-66, Fig. 4A et seq, Sixtus).

As to claim 7,

Sixtus teaches wherein the object attributes are represented by numerical values and/or text strings (see col. 9, lines 25-30, Fig. 4A et seq, Sixtus).

As to claim 8,

Sixtus teaches wherein an object attribute represents price information about the object (see col. 9, lines 25-30, Fig. 4A, Sixtus).

As to claim 9,

Sixtus teaches wherein the objects can be transmitted to the client for display in different formats including XML, HTML, XHTML or WML formats (see col. 7, lines 60-61, Fig. 4A, Sixtus).

As to claim 10,

Sixtus teaches wherein an object selected by a client is stored on the transaction server together with the corresponding object attribute and a client specific session ID (see col. 8, lines 1-5, Fig. 4A, Sixtus).

As to claim 11,

Sixtus teaches wherein the transaction server forwards to a client a request for finally confirming the transaction before executing the transaction.

Claims 12 and 13 have the same subject matter as of claim 1 as described above and essentially rejected for the same reasons.

With respect to claim 14,

Sixtus discloses a computer system (see Fig. 1) comprising:

a catalog server (20) for storing a plurality of objects comprising object data and object attributes containing further information about the object (see col. 3, lines 28-43, Fig. 1, Sixtus), and

for storing an object ID identifying an object, the catalog server (20) being accessible by a plurality of clients (see col. 3, lines 28-43, Fig. 1, Sixtus), and

a transaction server (30) accessible for a plurality of clients (10) for executing online transactions with respect to the objects stored in the catalog server (20) (see col. 3, lines 50-60, Fig. 1, Sixtus),

wherein the object attributes are transmittable directly from the catalog server (20) to the transaction server (30) without client interaction (see col. 4, lines 1-10 et seq, Sixtus).

Sixtus does not explicitly indicate the claimed catalog server.

Helland discloses claimed catalog server (registering COM attributes and the transaction server execution attribute in the system registry, the server application component is registered in a transaction server catalog, see col. 11, lines 64-67, Fig. 3, Helland).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine teachings of cited references because catalog server of Helland's teachings would have allowed Sixtus system for transaction processing with the server application components as suggested by Helland. Further, catalog as taught by Helland improves for transactional attribute of a server application component to performs multiple database updates (see col. 4, lines 1-3, Helland).

With respect to claim 15,

Sixtus discloses a catalog server (20) (see Fig. 1) comprising a storage unit (21) for storing objects for online transactions, the objects comprising object data and object attributes containing further information about the object (see col. 3, lines 28-43, Fig. 1 et seq, Sixtus), wherein the objects are assigned object IDs identifying the object (see col. 3, lines 50-59, Sixtus), and an output unit for outputting at least one object attribute upon receiving the corresponding object ID (see col. 7, lines 45-47, Sixtus).

Sixtus does not explicitly indicate the claimed catalog server.

Helland discloses claimed catalog server (registering COM attributes and the transaction server execution attribute in the system registry, the server application component is registered in a transaction server catalog, see col. 11, lines 64-67, Fig. 3, Helland).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine teachings of cited references because catalog server of Helland's teachings would have allowed Sixtus system for transaction processing with the server application components as suggested by Helland. Further, catalog as taught by Helland improves for transactional attribute of a server application component to performs multiple database updates (see col. 4, lines 1-3, Helland).

As to claim 16,

Sixtus teaches wherein the object attributes are represented by numerical values or text strings (see col. 9, lines 25-31, Sixtus).

As to claim 17,

Sixtus discloses a wherein the object attributes contain price information about the object (see col. 9, lines 25-31, Sixtus).

As to claim 18,

Sixtus teaches a wherein the stored objects can be transmitted to a client for display in different formats including XML, HTML, XHTML and WML formats (see col. 7, lines 60-61, Fig. 4A, Sixtus).

With respect to claim 19,

Sixtus discloses a transaction server (20) for executing online transactions over a communication network comprising a processing unit (see col. 3, lines 28-32, Fig. 1)

for receiving a transaction request from a client (10) requesting an online transaction relating to a specific object, the request containing object data and an object ID identifying the object (see col. 3, lines 28-43, Fig. 1, Sixtus),

requesting from a catalog server (20) object attributes containing further information about the object selected by the users the request containing the object ID (see col. 8, lines 1-5, Fig. 4A et seq, Sixtus), and

executing the online transaction using the information contained in the object attributes received from the catalog server (20) (see col. 8, lines 1-5, Fig. 4A, Sixtus).

Sixtus does not explicitly indicate the claimed catalog server.

Helland discloses claimed catalog server (registering COM attributes and the transaction server execution attribute in the system registry, the server application

component is registered in a transaction server catalog, see col. 11, lines 64-67, Fig. 3, Helland).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine teachings of cited references because catalog server of Helland's teachings would have allowed Sixtus system for transaction processing with the server application components as suggested by Helland. Further, catalog as taught by Helland improves for transactional attribute of a server application component to performs multiple database updates (see col. 4, lines 1-3, Helland).

As to claim 20,

Sixtus teaches a comprising a confirmation unit forwarding to the client (10) a confirmation request, and executing the online transaction only after having received a confirmation from the client (10) (see col. 8, lines 1-5, Fig. 4A, Sixtus).

As to claim 21,

Sixtus teaches a wherein the object displayed on a client display is assigned a display field for user selection of the object, wherein the selection of the object by a user initiates a transfer of the m to the t4kl., of the transaction server (30) (see col. 7, lines 60-66, Fig. 4A, Sixtus).

As to claim 22,

Sixtus discloses a wherein tht object displayed on a client display is associated a display field for user selection of the object, wherein the selection of the object by a user initiates a transfer of the ID to the URL of the transaction server (30) (see col. 7, lines 60-66, Fig. 4A, et seq Sixtus).

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of Time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad Ali whose telephone number is (571) 272-4105. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (7:30 am-6:00 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mohammad Ali
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2167

MA
February 26, 2005


MOHAMMAD ALI
PRIMARY EXAMINER